

Remarks

Applicant respectfully submits this amendment in full compliance with the Examiner's teaching in the non-final rejection of April 16, 2008. *No arguments presented in this amendment.*

Objections to Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification due to informalities. As taught and suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has corrected "bold" to read - - bolt - - in page 4 line 21. Applicant has also corrected "...a piston 2 which forms a hole 2, and a catch rod 2a'..." to read - - ... a piston 2 which forms a hole 2a, and a catch rod 2a'..." to match the reference numerals of the figures.

Objections to Claims

The Examiner has objected to the claims because reference characters were not enclosed within parentheses. In response, Applicant has enclosed the reference characters each within parentheses.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicant has amended the claims in compliance with the Examiner's teaching.

In Claim 1, Applicant has amended the preamble to read "A door closer which is fabricated in a hydraulic or air cylinder shape in its body and being installed to a door (10) or a doorframe (11)..." so as to claim "a door closer" subcombination over a closer-door combination.

Applicant has further amended *vague and indefinite phrases* in Claim 1, where "right or left side" was deleted to read "... a rotatable force adjustment nut (7), ~~which is rotatable to right or left side~~, is assembled to the subsidiary plate (9a)...", where "hemi-cylindrical shaped protrusions" has been amended to read "...a surface of the cylinder (1) being ~~provided with~~ hemi-cylindrical shaped protrusions...", and where "...extending linearly in the longitudinal direction, a piston (2)..." has been amended to read "...extending linearly in the longitudinal direction along a piston (2)..." within the initial disclosure of the instant application.

In Claim 2, Applicant has replaced "...can be, if needed..." with - - ...*is*...- - to eliminate indefiniteness.

In Claims 4 and 5, Applicant has deleted "...so that the piston rod (3) can be moved in the force adjustment nut (7)..." within the scope and meaning of the instant application.

In Claim 5, Applicant has deleted "...one end of it being blocked by a round plate with a small central through-hole..." within the scope and meaning of the instant application.

Conclusion

Applicant now believes that Claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance with this amendment or, if required, under Examiner's Amendment. It is respectfully requested that a timely notice of allowance be issued on this case.

Respectively submitted,

Date: June 24, 2008



James E. Bame

Regis. No. 44521

Tel: 213-384-7200

IPLA P.A.

3580 Wilshire Blvd 17th Fl.

Los Angeles, CA 90010